



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

warning, became a modest Matron" (Works, ed. Grosart, Vol. X, p. 256, A Disputation Betweene a Hee and a Shee Conny-Catcher, 1590) is taken from a tale in Gascoigne's "The Adventures of Master F. J." 1573 (ed. W. C. Hazlitt, Vol. I, p. 473).

JOHN CLARK JORDAN.

The University of Illinois.

ABRAHAM CUPID

Referring to Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, Act II, Sc. 1, line 13, one finds the expression *Abraham Cupid*—a reading frequently altered by editors to read *Adam Cupid* in order to make sense out of a reading that seems to be devoid of real meaning. On the basis of the following evidence (although it is not sixteenth-century evidence), I prefer to keep the original reading and to interpret the expression as meaning simply *naked* Cupid.

According to the *New Eng. Dict.*, *Abrahamman* was in 1561 a cant term for beggar—a "bare-armed and bare-legged" vagabond—and possibly had its origin in the parable of the beggar in Luke XVI. It was the custom of such vagabonds to attract attention by saying *Tom's a-cold* (as Edgar does in *Lear*) with obvious reference to their nakedness. This connotation seems to have survived as late as the middle of the eighteenth century, for in the beggar's vernacular of that period I find *Abram* denoting *nakedness*. My authority for this statement is a dictionary of the cant language found in the sixth edition of the *Apology for the Life of Bampfylde Moore Carew, King of the Beggars*,¹ in which *Abram* is defined as meaning, "naked, without clothes, or scarce enough to cover the nakedness."

Without overlooking the necessity for discovering sixteenth-century substantiation of this assumption, I am inclined to believe that it is reasonable to accept the expression *Abra-*

ham Cupid as meaning *naked* Cupid,² especially when one considers that it is customary to represent Cupid as being nearly naked.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

Cornell University.

WINTHROP AND CURTIS

In the introduction to a new edition of Theodore Winthrop's *The Canoe and the Saddle* (1913), edited and published by Mr. John H. Williams of Tacoma, Washington, I find the amazing statement that "Curtis did not know Winthrop as an author" when he wrote the biographical sketch of Winthrop which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for August, 1861. The two men were near neighbors and intimate friends for several years, Curtis had already made some success as an author and some reputation as an editor, and it would have been very strange if, after Winthrop had fallen in battle, he had not looked into Winthrop's manuscripts before writing the sketch. He certainly knew *Our March to Washington* and *The Heart of the Andes*, both already published, and as we see from the following letter, *Love and Skates*, the best seller of any of Winthrop's books—a charming novelette. The above-mentioned Mr. Williams, in a most astonishing pamphlet (cf. *N. Y. Nation*, 26 February, 1914, *Notes*), assumes that Curtis did not know *Cecil Dreeme*, *John Brent*, and *Edwin Brothertoft* simply because he did not quote them. He referred to them, though not by name—for the names were all altered before publication,—and quoted only a few apposite sections of Winthrop's correspondence from the front, and some uncompleted notes for a military article for the *Atlantic*. A critic rarely quotes from unpublished writings for illustrative purposes—he quotes from material with which his readers are presumably familiar—because he is a critic, not a propagandist or advertiser; and it was perhaps for this reason

² The editors of *The 'First Folio' Shakespeare* (T. Y. Crowell & Co., New York) arrive at the same conclusion.

¹ London, Goadby and Owen, 1765.

that he did not quote from manuscript, not even from *Love and Skates*, which he had certainly seen and which is the most clearly achieved of Winthrop's work. The following letter is of interest, concerning *Love and Skates* and also concerning Mr. Curtis's attitude and character:¹

NORTH SHORE, S. I., Jan. 30th, 63.

Dear Mr. FIELDS.

Now that the last of Theodore's works is soon to appear, I take the liberty of expressing to you a wish which has been gaining ground with me and with all of us for a long time. It is that a proper and dignified review of his writings should be prepared for the "Atlantic" by some loving and capable hand. The newspaper and magazine notices, though laudatory enough to suit the most eager desire for praise are shallow and indiscriminating, partly from their necessary limits, partly from the kind of critic, that "the bookman" must be of course. Neither is it possible that any of them should have the knowledge that would enable them to speak of the industry and patience with which my brother wrought out his style, or the care with which he studied the accessories of his pictures! I would also suggest that, if you approve, Curtis be the person asked to do it—not only that his power as a critic and gracefulness as a writer would enable him to do ample justice to the subject—not only because he has made himself familiar with nearly every thing Theodore has written, unpublished as well as published, but also that he may have the opportunity to do justice to *himself*. For I find to my surprise that there are people mean enough to say that Curtis might have assisted to bring him forward as an author, and that he did not was a proof of jealousy lest he be eclipsed! And I should add that the expression "not great genius which is ever salient" in his biographical sketch has been quoted as indicating an unwillingness to give him due credit. To us who know his noble nature, his genuine admiration of Theodore's books and his joy in their success, as well as the helping hand he always holds forth to his literary brethren, this is simply absurd and ridiculous, and the mention of the fact that Theodore never showed him any of his writings but 'Love and Skates' which he immediately recommended his sending to the Atlantic, and gave him a note of introduction to Lowell to facilitate its acceptance, is sufficient answer so far as it is known, but for his own dear sake I would like it more widely known, and it might come in very properly in such an

article. Of course this is a mere suggestion; you will do as you please, and gratified as I should be by such a notice of my brother, I shall be *satisfied* with your decision either way.

I remain, Truly your friend,

E. W. WINTHROP.

The "proper and dignified review" which did appear was written by G. P. Lathrop. I have elsewhere discussed the editorship of the Winthrop books.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

Columbia University.

ANENT JEROME AND THE SUMMONER'S FRIAR

"Ye need not stop work to inform us; we knew it ten seasons before." Kipling's monitory line is directly applicable to several of the present writer's parallels between the Second Book of Jerome's *Jovinian* treatise and sundry utterances of the Summoner's Friar (*Modern Language Notes*, January, 1915). My friend, Professor Tatlock, kindly draws my attention to Koeppel's exposition of the chief of these resemblances (*Anglia*, XIII, 178-179) and to his own mention of these in his *Development and Chronology*, pp. 101, 202. My oversight finds its only palliation in the prevailing disregard of Koeppel's evidence on this point (1891). This has been ignored by Lounsbury (1892) in his discussion of Chaucer's relation to Jerome (*Studies*, II, 292-297), by Skeat (1894) in his *Notes upon Chaucer's Summoner's Tale*, by Pollard (1899) in the footnotes of the Globe edition, and by Miss Hammond (1908) in her statement in *Chaucer*, p. 93. Mea culpa! Mea culpa! But the infection was abroad and I sinned in much company.

And now another *amende*! One passage in my article, "The Shakspearean Mob" (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, December, 1912), which I thought all my own was the concluding comparison between Shakspeare's *Coriolanus* and Ibsen's *Enemy of the People*. Seemingly a *trouvaille*! But the striking likeness between the mob-dramas of the two authors had been pointed out years be-

¹Published through the kindness of Mrs. James T. Fields, who states that the letter is "From Elizabeth Winthrop, Theodore's sister."